



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,917	06/14/2001	Stephen P. Forte	T7093.0016/P016	5556
20988	7590	01/25/2010	EXAMINER	
OGILVY RENAULT LLP			PEREZ, ANGELICA	
1, Place Ville Marie				
SUITE 2500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MONTREAL, QC H3B 1R1			2618	
CANADA				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/879,917	FORTE, STEPHEN P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANGELICA M. PEREZ	2618	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 November 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27 and 28 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-26 and 29 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after a decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but before the filing of a Notice of Appeal to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or the commencement of a civil action. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/24/09 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 11/24/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) "Applicant believes that the amended claims, as presented, are in condition for immediate allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the claims."

In response to argument (A), the examiner would like to indicate that the prior art of record reads on the newly amended claims; therefore, the application is not in condition for allowance (Please, see rejection below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10-13, 15-18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over, Hartmaier (Hartmaier et al.; US Patent No.: 5,978,672 A) in view of Jackson (Jackson, Allen; US Patent No.: 6,275,577 B1) and further in view of LaPierre (LaPierre, Steven R.; US Patent no.: 6,771,761 B1).

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Hartmaier teaches of a telecommunication device, network, method and enterprise comprising (columns 1, 3 and 5; lines 5-7, 10-14 and 17-22; where the third set of lines teaches of a device): a telephony interface (column 8, lines 65-67) for receiving a telephone call via a first communication path and identifying a dialed telephone number associated with the call (column 12, lines 37-40; where the telephone receiving the call represents and identifying a dialed telephone number associated with the call; column 12, lines 37-40; e.g., “call screening”), the telephony interface using the dialed telephone number to retrieve at least one wireless telephone number and at least one user preference from a storage medium (column 12, lines 20-25; where it is inherent in the art to retrieve the information that has been stored previously).

Hartmaier does not specifically teach where the telephony interface routes the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously via respective second and third communication paths, and the telephony interface connecting the call to a user by connecting the first communication to the second or

third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user In related art, concerning call handling.

Jackson teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers associated with respective wireless devices capable of inbound and outbound communications substantially simultaneously via respective second and third communication paths (column 2, lines 3-28, figure 1, items 18 and 20 are connected by router 16 though separate wireless links; where the “telephone numbers” of a pager or other devices can be associated with devices that are not necessarily, the pager and phone, voice mail, etc), and the telephony interface connecting the call to a user by connecting the first communication to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by receipt of an acknowledgement signal (column 3, lines 12-24 and 55-58; where it is well known in the art that when a call is answered, it is acknowledged by the system).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier’s method for routing and connecting users to different units corresponding to different networks with Jackson’s route in the call to two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously in order to ensure that the called party can be reached, as taught by Jackson.

Hartmaier and Jackson do not specifically teach where the enterprise telecommunication network is solely associated with wireless devices.

In related art, concerning a system and method for caller-selectable call routing from a single telephone number, LaPierre teaches where the extensions of the

enterprise telecommunication network are solely associated with wireless devices (column 3, lines 42-47; where the system can employ only wireless devices, and columns 1 and 2, lines 65-67 and 1-17, respectively).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier and Jackson's method for routing and connecting users to different units corresponding to different networks with LaPierre's wireless PBX network in order to provide a universal number that can be linked to multiple destinations associated with one user, as taught by LaPierre.

Regarding claim 2, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier further teaches where a first wireless destination telephone number corresponds to the retrieved wireless telephone number and a second wireless destination telephone number corresponds to a retrieved second wireless telephone number (column 12, lines 37-40).

Regarding claims 3 and 24, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claims 2 and 23, respectively. Hartmaier also teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third destination number corresponding to a voice mailbox telephone number (column 15, lines 65-67).

LaPierre further teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third wireless destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number after a predetermined time as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 3, lines 3-9).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre's telephony interface route to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number and further with LaPierre's predetermined time in order to activate the messaging service after a certain elapsed time, as taught by LaPierre.

Regarding claim 5, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier also teaches where the telephony interface routes a first and second calls to a first wireless destination telephone number corresponding to the retrieved wireless telephone number and to a second wireless destination telephone number corresponding to a retrieved second wireless telephone number and as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 16, table 2; e.g., the table indicates in the upper 4 levels where the office phone is the prime number, the routing first preference is given to the office number followed. Similarly the bottom part provides the preference to the mobile phone according to the user preference).

Regarding claim 8, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a single destination telephone number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number (column 16, table 2; e.g., "office voice mail" is a single destination).

Regarding claim 10, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. In addition, Hartmaier where the telephony interface communicates with a private branch exchange, and where at least one of the at least one destination

telephone numbers is associated with the private branch exchange (column 11, lines 60-63).

Regarding claim 11, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 10. Hartmaier also teaches where the at least one destination telephone number associated with the private branch exchange is associated with a cellular telephone (column 11, lines 60-63).

Regarding claim 12, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 11. Hartmaier also teaches where the cellular telephone can operate independently from the device (column 3, lines 42-55; where the inherent programmable flexibility of cellular phones allows for independent as well as joint operability with other systems).

Regarding claim 13, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 11. Also, Hartmaier teaches where another of the at least two wireless destination telephone numbers is associated with a pager (column 12, lines 38-41).

Regarding claim 15, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface receives the call from a public switched telephone network, and where at least one of the at least one wireless destination telephone number is associated with a private branch exchange (columns 1,2 and 10; lines 16-21, 14-16 and 39-42 respectively; e.g., PSTN and column 9, lines 5-7; where the PBX is the destination number).

Regarding claim 16, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 15. Hartmaier further teaches where the at least one wireless destination

telephone number associated with the private branch exchange is associated with a cellular telephone (column 12, lines 36-42).

Regarding claim 17, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Also, Hartmaier teaches where the telephony interface is connected to a local area network and the at least one user preference is input via the local area network (column 1, lines 5-7).

Regarding claim 18, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface is connected to the Internet and the at least one user preference is input via the Internet (column 9, lines 38-44).

1. Claims 4, 6-7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmaier in view of Jackson and LaPierre and further in view of Chow (Chow et al., US Patent No.: 006,711,401 B1).

Regarding claim 4, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 3.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre do not specifically teach where the predetermined time corresponds to a number of telephone rings defined by the at least one retrieved user preference.

In related art concerning a wireless centrex call return Chow teaches where the predetermined time corresponds to a number of telephone rings defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 6, lines 35-40).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre's telephony interface with Chow's predefined number of telephone rings as one of a number of modes that the user can select, as taught by Chow.

Regarding claim 6, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 5.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre do not specifically teach where the at least one retrieved user preference defines a first ring count for the call to the first wireless destination telephone number and a second different ring count for the call to the second wireless destination telephone number.

Chow teaches where the at least one retrieved user preference defines a first ring count for the call to the first wireless destination telephone number and a second different ring count for the call to the second wireless destination telephone number (column 75, lines 5-14; e.g., ring type 1, ring type 2 and ring type; where the ringer can be programmed according to the user's preference).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre's telephony interface with Chow's different ring counts in order to be able to identify the type of call being received, as taught by Chow.

Regarding claim 7, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Chow teaches all the limitations of claim 6. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third wireless destination telephone number corresponding to the voice

mailbox telephone number after the telephony interface rings the first wireless destination number more than the first ring count (column 16, table 2; e.g., Idle and inactive in column 3 routed to office voice mail).

Regarding claim 14, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 10.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre do not specifically teach where one of at least two wireless destination telephone number is associated with a personal digital assistant.

Chow teaches where another of the at least one wireless destination telephone number is associated with a personal digital assistant (column 80, lines 62-67).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre's telephony interface with Chow's personal digital assistant as an option of a number of wireless devices.

2. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmaier in view of Jackson and LaPierre and further in view of Cox (Cox et al.; US Pub. No.: 2002/0,013,141 A1).

Regarding claim 9, Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre teach all the limitations of claim 1.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre does not specifically teach where the telephony interface prompts a caller of the telephone call with a menu of call destination options and the telephony interface places the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers in accordance with an option selected by the caller.

In related art concerning a method and system for personalized information services, Cox teaches where the telephony interface prompts a caller of the telephone call with a menu of call destination options and the telephony interface places the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers in accordance with an option selected by the caller (page 6, paragraphs 99-110; where the options can be customized according to the user's preference).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre's telecommunications network with Cox's menu in order to provide the caller with alternative routes of his/her preference.

3. Claims 19-23, 25 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over, Hartmaier in view of Jackson and LaPierre in view of Karpus (Karpus et al.; US Patent No.: 5,884,191).

Regarding claims 19 and 29, Hartmaier teaches of a telecommunication device, network, method and enterprise comprising (columns 1, 3 and 5; lines 5-7, 10-14 and 17-22; where the third set of lines teaches of a device): a telephony interface (column 8, lines 65-67) the telephony interface for receiving a telephone call via a first communication path and identifying a dialed telephone number associated with the call (column 12, lines 37-40; where the telephone receiving the call represents and identifying a dialed telephone number associated with the call; column 12, lines 37-40; e.g., "call screening"), the telephony interface using the identified dialed telephone number to retrieve a first enterprise extension telephone number associated with the

wireless telephone and to retrieve at least one user preference from a storage medium (column 12, lines 20-25; where it is inherent in the art to retrieve the information that has been stored previously), the telephony enterprise determining user access rights based on at least one enterprise preference associated with first enterprise extension telephone number (column 12, lines 10-56, where during the screening, telephone related to the user are compared and access rights are determined).

Hartmaier does not specifically teach where the telephony interface routes the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously via respective second and third communication paths, and the telephony interface connecting the call to a user by connecting the first communication to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user.

In related art, concerning call handling, Jackson teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to at least two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously via respective second and third communication paths (column 2, lines 3-28, figure 1, items 18 and 20 are connected by router 16 though separate wireless links), and the telephony interface connecting the call to a user by connecting the first communication to the second or third communication path when the second or third communication path is authenticated by the user (column 3, lines 12-24 and 55-58; where the user “authenticates” the call by accepting it after screening it).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier’s method for routing and connecting users to

different units corresponding to different networks with Jackson's route in the call to two wireless destination telephone numbers substantially simultaneously in order to ensure that the called party can be reached, as taught by Jackson.

Hartmaier and Jackson do not specifically teach where the enterprise telecommunication network is solely associated with wireless devices.

In related art, concerning a system and method for caller-selectable call routing from a single telephone number, LaPierre teaches where the extensions of the enterprise telecommunication network are solely associated with wireless devices (column 3, lines 42-47; where the system can employ only wireless devices, and columns 1 and 2, lines 65-67 and 1-17, respectively).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier and Jackson's method for routing and connecting users to different units corresponding to different networks with LaPierre's wireless PBX network in order to provide a universal number that can be linked to multiple destinations associated with one user, as taught by LaPierre.

Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre do not specifically teach of generating and sending the simulated dial tone to the wireless telephone to provide access to the enterprise communications network based on the at least one user preference and at least one enterprise preference associated with the enterprise telephone number; and where the extensions of the enterprise telecommunication network are solely associated with wireless devices.

In related art concerning interface systems for a mobile office environment, Karpus teaches of generating and sending the simulated dial tone to the wireless telephone to provide access to the enterprise communications network based on the at least one user preference and at least one enterprise preference associated with the enterprise telephone number (column 4, lines 49-54; where the preference).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier, Jackson and LaPierre's method of providing access to an enterprise telecommunication network with Kraus's simulated dial tone in order to provide access notification to a cellular telephone.

Regarding claim 20, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 19. Hartmaier further teach where the at least one enterprise preference comprises a security group defining authorized outbound call access of a user of the wireless telephone (column 14, lines 58-65).

Regarding claim 21, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 19. Hartmaier further teaches where the at least one user preference comprises a dial tone timeout period, where the user of the wireless telephone is prevented from placing a call after the dial tone timeout expires (column 12, line 10-14; where it is known in the art that a phone call can not be placed after a dial tone expires).

Regarding claim 22, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 19. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface further comprises: means for receiving a second telephone call, the second telephone call being placed to the first enterprise extension telephone number; means for identifying

the first enterprise extension telephone number from the second call; means for using the first enterprise extension telephone number to retrieve at least the wireless telephone number; and means for using the at least one user preference to route the second call via a second communication path to at least one destination telephone number, where the at least one destination telephone number is selected from the group consisting of the wireless telephone number and a voice mailbox telephone number (column 16, lines 10; where when the telephone is “busy and active”, a phone call being held, a second call is routed to the “office voice mail”. Also, where the “enterprise” corresponds to the office network. Moreover, a second call can be received after a first call; therefore, the procedure is the same as that of the first call).

Regarding claim 23, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 22. Hartmaier further teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to two destination telephone numbers simultaneously, a first destination telephone number corresponding to the retrieved wireless telephone number and a second destination telephone number corresponding to a retrieved second telephone number (column 16, table 2, columns 1 and 2 in the table indicate the office phone and mobile phone as the receivers of the call at the same time).

Regarding claim 25, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 22. Hartmaier also teaches where the telephony interface routes a first and second calls to a first destination telephone number corresponding to the retrieved wireless telephone number and to a second destination telephone number corresponding to a retrieved second telephone number in a sequential manner and as

defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 16, table 2; e.g., the table indicates in the upper 4 levels where the office phone is the prime number, the routing first preference is given to the office number followed. Similarly the bottom part provides the preference to the mobile phone according to the user preference).

4. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over, Hartmaier in view of Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus and further in view of Chow (Chow et al., US Patent No.: 006,711,401 B1).

Regarding claim 24, Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus teach all the limitations of claim 23. Hartmaier also teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number.

Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus do not specifically teach where the telephony interface routes the call to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number after a predetermined time as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference.

In related art concerning a wireless centre call return, Chow teaches where the telephony interface routes the call to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox telephone number after a predetermined time as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference (column 6, lines 35-40; where the “selected” time periods correspond to the user preferences).

It would have been obvious to a one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Hartmaier, Jackson, LaPierre and Karpus’ telephony interface routes to a third destination number corresponding to the voice mailbox

telephone number with Chow's predetermined time as defined by the at least one retrieved user preference in order to activate the messaging service after a certain elapsed time, as taught by Chow.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Paten No.: 6405041 B1, refers to a concurrent ringing on multiple network telephones.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Angelica Perez whose telephone number is 571-272-7885. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m., Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on (571) 272-7882. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571-273-8300 for regular communications and for After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either the PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through the Private PAIR only. For more information about the pair system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Art Unit: 2618

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Information regarding Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system can be found at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2600's customer service number is 703-306-0377.

/A. M. P./ Examiner, Art Unit 2618	/Nay A. Maung/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618
---	---